



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/527,681	03/11/2005	Mario Scholz	39509-213285	9162
26694	7590	01/22/2008		
VENABLE LLP P.O. BOX 34385 WASHINGTON, DC 20043-9998			EXAMINER LOEWE, ROBERT S	
			ART UNIT 1796	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/22/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No. 10/527,681	Applicant(s) SCHOLZ ET AL.	
	Examiner Robert Loewe	Art Unit 1796	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 07 December 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____
Claim(s) objected to: _____
Claim(s) rejected: 1 and 3-7.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☒ Other: see attached.

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Claim 1 contains a typographical error "liqid" and other amendments require further search and/or consideration.

Art Unit: 1796

ATTACHMENT TO ADVISORY ACTION***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments/amendments, filed 12/7/07, have been fully considered; however, the amendment of instant claim 4 has not been entered given that it introduces new issues that would require further search and/or consideration. Specifically, claim 4 has been amended to no longer be dependent from instant claim 1, and as such, is much broader than originally presented, requiring further search and consideration.

Applicant's arguments/amendments, filed 12/7/07, have been fully considered; however, the amendments of instant claims 1, 6 and 7 have not been entered given that it does not remove the previously applied prior art.

Specifically, Applicant's argue that Mangold et al. (US Pat. 6,328,944) does not anticipate all of the claim limitations of instant claim 1. However, as noted in a previous Office action, Mangold et al., in view of Azechi et al. (US Pat. 6,331,588), collectively teach the limitations of instant claim 1. The motivation for a person having ordinary skill in the art to employ the pyrogenically prepared silicas doped with potassium in silicone as taught by Mangold et al. into the LSR compositions as taught by Azechi et al. comes from Mangold et al. (3:26-36). Further, a person having ordinary skill in the art would recognize that silicone compositions fall into only a limited number of categories; addition-curable polysiloxanes being one such type of silicone rubber. Because of this, a person having ordinary skill in the art would appreciate the benefit that the pyrogenically prepared silicas doped with potassium have as additives/fillers for addition-curable silicone/polysiloxane compositions.

Art Unit: 1796

Applicant's further argue in footnote 1 that the process of Mangold et al. and the instant applications differ. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., different process) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant's further argue unexpected results in footnote 2. Instant claim 7 claims that "the silicone rubber possess lower viscosities and flow limits as compared with doped aerosils (fumed silicas) of equal or similar surface area". However, the instant application compares **undoped** comparison silicas (paragraph 0090 of instant pre-grant publication) and not "doped aerosils" as currently claimed. Further, particle surface area is not the only property which would contribute to the final physical properties presented in the instant application; pH, particle size, particle shape, degree of surface functionality, and DBP absorption are all expected to play a role in the final physical properties of the cured silicone rubber. Therefore, there is insufficient evidence to satisfy the argument of unexpected results.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert Loewe whose telephone number is (571) 270-3298. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30 AM to 5:00 PM EST.

Art Unit: 1796

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Eashoo can be reached on (571) 272-1197. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

RSL
18-Dec-07



MARK EASHOO, PH.D.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

18 Jan 08